



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

circular to every librarian in that State outlining the advantages of these Alcoves. Will not other State Peace Societies follow its example?

## KRAUSE'S PROPOSITION FOR A EUROPEAN LEAGUE OF STATES

**D**R. CLAY MACCAULEY, of Tokyo, Japan, vice-president of the American Peace Society in Japan and also a counselor of the Japan Peace Society, has kindly sent to us three articles of his appearing in *The Japan Advertiser*, January 30-31 and February 1, 1917. The articles set forth the contribution of Karl Christian Friedrich Krause, a professor of philosophy in Berlin over one hundred years ago.

Krause was born in 1781 and died in 1832. Influenced by Kant's Essay on Perpetual Peace and by a deep interest in the problems of international peace, he published in the months of June and July, 1814, in Berlin, in the *Deutsche Blätter*, dated May 24, "A proposition for a European League of States, as a basis for universal peace, and as a just defense against all attacks upon the inner and outer peace of Europe." After elaborating what he believed to be the conditions under which the proposed European League should be formed, Krause ventured a definite statement of the main articles which he believed should be embodied in its constitution. The following series of articles Krause conceived to be the main factors needed for the perfection of the Holy Alliance, then actively coming into existence:

### I

The States which are entering this League of Nations should unite for the purpose of making authoritative among themselves, in its complete comprehension, the principle of right.

### II

Consequently, they should, first, agree to formulate and to sanction a Code of National Right, then to organize their own relationship in accordance with this code; to seek to develop this code continuously by common cooperation; to maintain and to protect it in all its parts against inner and outer attack, through watchfulness and care and by debate, and, if need be, by the legitimate use of force. The chief articles in this body of legislation for the nations should provide that:

a. Every separate people or State is a fully equal, equally justified, member or "person" in this League for National Right. Each State should enjoy its rights and should receive the protection of the League, independently of the numbers in its population or of the magnitude and position of its territory. The States composing the League should be bound together as thoroughly, equally free sovereignties; as such their governments should all be of equal rank; all equally justified; all equal before the law and the judgment of the federated Union.

The government of the League as such, therefore, can never be personally monarchic, but only so far a monarchy as the League governs itself by the unity and equality of its law.

b. The States of the League should reciprocally guar-

antee among themselves wholly equal rights to their own territories and a mutual hospitality of intercourse; also they should assure for all fully equal rights to common waterways, to all interior lakes and seas, and to the ocean so far as the power of the League might extend.

c. The association of each people, or nation, with the League should be wholly voluntary, and just as voluntary should be its release from the Union. But each of the nations should be required to fulfill whatever obligations relating to national rights with which it had originally bound itself to the League. The League, however, should not have power to exclude any of its members who have violated the fundamental agreement of the Union, except in consequence of a judgment given in accord with the League's original covenant.

d. The States in the League might invite or induce other States to come into their Union; but this inducement should be made only under conditions of freedom; never violating another people's free will or disturbing their social development; never putting them under guardianship in the names of right or compelling them by force to enter the League.

e. The States of the League should concede to all other peoples their inherent, natural right, wholly apart from a consideration of their membership or non-membership in the Union.

f. The peoples united in this League should give themselves—wholly without reference to compulsory right, or to self-advantage, or to defense under peril, or by impulse to revenge—to the furtherance and protection of all their rights. They should acknowledge as unconditionally valid the legal, judicial decisions of the League, given by a common court, concerning any matter of dispute relating to rights or matters of justice. And they should promise to accept such judgment without reserve; let the dispute be with a State that is within the League or outside it.

Consequent upon observance of this obligation a lasting peace would prevail among the States of the League, as such, and no separate State would initiate war with a people outside the Union. There would be no appeal made beyond the judgment of the League court. A State that would not accept the decision of the League court would be excluded and become an outer State in relation to the League.

g. The States of the League, further, should be pledged to assure, to protect and to defend, with their united power, all the rights of the several States and the rights of the League itself against every other State or coalition of States; also to conclude and to ratify special defensive and offensive alliances in case of war, in accord with the condition of the League and of its component States and with regard to the circumstances existing at the time.

But only the whole League should have authority to declare war or to make peace, and it should do this only by public proclamation in the name of the League.

### III

The contracting allied States should create a League court. This tribunal should pass judgment in freedom in accordance with the law of the nations—such as has been indicated in preceding articles—following an open and regular investigation consequent upon formal complaint and a considered defense.

The judgment of the League is a *judicium parium*. And it should not impose punishment. It should lay before a State under judgment the conditions to which it must conform if it would remain a member of the League. In case of refusal of compliance with these conditions exclusion from the League would follow.

#### IV

The leagued States should guarantee, reciprocally, with their united powers pledged, the fulfillment of the requirements of their legal code and the judgments of their League court.

#### V

The League should create for its legislation and for the case of all relationships under national right a permanent Federal Council. This Council should deliberate over the farther development of the League within the whole province of national right; it should make and publish new laws and put them into operation.

The government of the League should lie in the Federal Council only. The Council should consist of the sovereign personalities of the supreme government of each of the States of the League—that is, of the ruling persons, princes, or nobles or the presidents of the States. And these representatives, either in person or by ambassadors having full powers, should continuously appear in the sessions of the Council and serve the interest of the League.

But each State should have only one representative in the Council or, at most, only one vote. As members of the Council all representatives should have equal right; none given preference, whatever names or signs of distinction they might otherwise have—no *primes inter pares*. Therefore, this Federal Council should have no presidents.

In the private relations of the governments included within the League there might be orders of rank and preferences of honorary titles; also the several States as separate States might maintain relations with other States by the service of ambassadors and like officials.

#### VI

This Federal Council might announce to all nations that the League aims at the establishment of a perfected status of human right among all the earth's peoples; that it seeks to realize an ideal of international justice; consequently to bring about the cessation of war; indeed, to advance a higher development of all human affairs and institutions, so far as they can be advances under the conditions of human right. Therefore, the Council would regard as within its province the hearing and testing of all propositions for the betterment of the separate States and of the League, as such; also for the advancement of science and art and of education and of religion; all these things, however, only so far as they could be promoted in harmony with right and in accord with the free moral evolution of men and humanity. It might be within the province of the Council, also, to spread among the States knowledge of generally useful agencies, and then, after a wide acceptance of them, to introduce them into the Federal legislation.

#### VII

The decisions of all-inclusive effect made by the Federal Council should have the force of law only by the unanimous consent of the States. But if in consequence of debate over such matters as those affecting only single States a division of judgment should occur, then, so far as the fundamental agreement of the Federal League is not harmed, the separate States might follow their own wishes. In case, however, the division should occur over questions or matters which radically concern the League, as such, the party being in the majority might submit to the minority the alternative choice of accepting the majority vote or of giving up membership in the League. In case the minority would not concede to the majority, the Council might confer over the question, Whether it were not better to postpone the whole matter under debate rather than that the dissenting member should resign from the League?

#### VIII

In this eighth article Krause dealt with the choice of the working personnel or office-holders needed for the care of the various departments required for the League's work. He gave a series of practical suggestions that need not be repeated here. He added, however, that this administrative or executive body should be without any legislative authority whatever. Such authority in the first and last instance should lie wholly in the Federal Council.

#### IX

The proposed League of European Nations, continued Krause, should be understood throughout the world as being, above all, and essentially through all, just a League for human right—as being, in fact, just that. Krause would have had the League proclaimed as being resolved to perpetuate itself; to defend itself against all assaults from within and from without, and not to acknowledge for itself or for any of its constituent members any outer protectorate or guardianship. The League would carry its purpose forward for itself; but at the same time it would declare that every other people or nation on the planet is a brother people, a justified citizen of the realm of humanity upon the earth, be it near or far, little or big, rich or poor, mighty or weak, high or low in culture.

Also Krause would have the League offer itself as mediator or arbitrator in all international differences within its own borders, or even outside them, and to become a friendly guide for the nations, seeking to prevent the incoming among them of differences which only the forces of war could end. It should be clearly seen, said Krause, that the League aims at no farther influence upon peoples outside its membership than that of a helpful sympathy and counsel. In this way the League would gain more than through a show of physical power. A favored people that would bear itself justly and kindly toward people less favored would be readily and gratefully accepted as educator and sponsor.

Moreover, the League should clearly and positively renounce every attempt to gain territory or population through fraud or war, either for itself or for any of its component States; also that it would never acknowledge might as the basis of right.

## X—XI

In these two articles Krause discussed the question of the capital to be chosen and the language to be used for the common needs of the proposed League. Under the circumstances existing a hundred years ago, Berlin and the German language seemed to be most convenient agencies for serving these needs.

Dr. MacCauley adds this note:

In the magazine *Die Neue Zeit* (*The New Age*), a quarterly published in Prague, Bohemia, in the year 1873, where I found the extraordinarily timely essay, from which I have drawn the articles here published, by courtesy of *The Japan Advertiser*, there is an editorial note to this effect:

"This proposition of Krause's is not given as an absolutely ideal offering for securing the right intercourse of the world's nations; but it does bear upon the present (1873) unjust conditions prevalent among the peoples of Europe. Krause did not undertake the impossibility in his age of wholly setting aside war, but only to advance the possibility for the nations, in most cases, to avoid war.

"However, this proposal is fully ideal, so far as it puts forward and holds fast the principle that right should go before might; that, absolutely, might may not be made coincident with right in that the just State is summoned to protect the weak. Krause's proposal is, also, ideal in that it is directed toward the ethical-religious sense—the noble side of men and of nations."

## BRIEF PEACE NOTES

ON November 7 was announced the arrival at a British port of Colonel House, head of the special commission which is to represent this country in the Inter-Allied Conference. Accompanying Colonel House are Admiral W. S. Benson, Chief of Naval Operations; Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, Chief of Staff, United States Army; Oscar T. Crosby, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; Vance C. McCormick, Chairman of the War Trade Board; Bainbridge Colby, United States Shipping Board; Dr. Alonzo E. Taylor, representing the Food Controller; Thomas Nelson Perkins, representing the Priority Board; and Gordon Auchincloss, as secretary. Mr. Crosby and Mr. McCormick are members of the American Peace Society.

. . . The words of the Hon. C. T. Wang, Vice-President of the Chinese Senate, cast some light upon the significance of the agreement recently entered into by the United States Department of State and the Japanese Special Mission headed by Viscount Ishii, as well as upon the formal protest of the Chinese Government, which followed. They are quoted from an article by the Rev. W. Reginald Wheeler (formerly a fellow-student of Mr. Wang at Yale University) in *The New York Times Current History* for November:

With the strongly ingrained love for democracy and the firm belief in the necessity of subordinating military authority under the civil, in the character of our people, we do not hesitate for a minute to affirm that in China, just as it is in free and democratic nations of the world, constitution-

alism shall prevail over militarism. We, like the Entente Allies, have time on our side. We shall have to make the same sacrifices for the final victory of constitutionalism and democracy as they are making in their titanic struggle on the battlefield of Europe. Let us resolve that we will.

In this vital struggle where shall America, the champion of democracy, stand? We entirely agree with Mr. Milliard in his views expressed through the editorial columns of his paper [*Milliard's Review*] on July 28, which we will reproduce here for emphasis:

"A primary requisite is that, as between reversion to an archaic monarchy, or the retention of a military oligarchy, or a graduated advance toward genuine republicanism, the influence of the United States ought to be thrown definitely to bring about the last-named. *If this leads to quasi-interference with Chinese politics, then that responsibility must be faced.* [The italics are our own—Eds.] It is becoming rather ridiculous, at a time when America is engaged in a world war, when the whole life of the American people is being readjusted to meet these war conditions, and with the avowed principal object of saving democratic principles of government from being smothered by autocratic militarism, that the power and influence of the United States should be applied in one place abroad, and should not be applied in another place abroad; that direct American assistance should be accorded to some nations that are trying to cast off the yoke of autocracy and be denied to other nations that are making the same office."

At any rate, neither France nor Great Britain, we take it, would raise any objection to America giving substantial aid to China. By process of elimination, Japan is the only power left whose attitude is doubtful. Will she object or will she not if the United States renews her open-door policy? If she objects, and does not wish China to grow strong and united and to establish and develop liberal and democratic institutions, then, as Mr. Milliard puts it, "It is very important for China to know it, and for the United States to know it." In view of the repeated assurance given both by the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Japanese press, we are rather persuaded that if the United States renews the open-door policy at this juncture Japan is likely to fall in with it.

Mr. Wang adds a second and third suggestion for assistance to his country that can well be rendered by the United States. These are money and industrial experts.

. . . From the same magazine we take the following singularly clear exposition of the German meaning in the stipulation they have made for "freedom of the seas." As they have too plainly said, they do not mean that freedom to trade around the world which Great Britain has, with her navy, guaranteed to all the nations of the world these many years past. What they do mean, as here given by Count zu Reventlow, at a public meeting in Berlin in March, 1917, in a paper which, there is every reason to believe, was carefully censored by governmental authorities, is "another story," as we see:

What do we Germans understand by the freedom of the seas? Of course, we do not mean by it that free use of the sea which is the common privilege of all nations in times of peace—the right to the open highways of international trade. That sort of freedom of the sea we had before the war. What we understand today by this doctrine is that Germany should possess such maritime territories and such naval bases that at the outbreak of a war we should be able, with our navy ready, reasonably to guarantee ourselves the command of the seas. We want such a jumping-off place for our navy as would give us a fair chance of dominating the seas and of being free of the seas during a war. [Cheers.] The inalienable possession of the Belgian seaboard is therefore a matter of life and death to us, and the man is a traitor who would faint-heartedly relinquish this coast to England. Our aim must be not only to keep what